

# CSU-AAUP

## Testimony by

Vijay Nair, President

Connecticut State University American Association of University Professors

At the Appropriations Committee's Public Hearing on the Governor's Proposed Budget  
February 28, 2011

Good evening, Senator Harp, Representative Walker, Sen. Maynard, Rep. Willis, and members of the Committee. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify before you today.

With the limited time available, allow me to make just five points for your consideration:

- 1) The proposed reduction of 10% in the general fund allocation for CSU cannot be achieved by streamlining management alone; it will reach into the classroom and harm our students. CSU may have some management bloat; but not of a magnitude sufficient to absorb the proposed cuts. Our enrollment has continued to increase year-by-year without proportional increases in full-time faculty; almost 60% of CSU faculty are now part-time. The proposed reduction will certainly make this situation worse, resulting in even fewer full-time faculty, diminished academic programs, and larger class sizes. We applaud the Governor's desire to provide more funding for instruction, but unfortunately, the present proposal will not accomplish that goal.
- 2) The sweeping power given to the proposed Board of Regents to transfer funds from one constituent unit to another (*H. B. 6380, Sec. 41*) limits legislative authority and makes planning by any of the units nearly impossible. Also, under the current proposal the block grant for the three constituent units will be appropriated directly to the Board of Regents, which will then allocate appropriations to the individual institutions based on performance and outcome measures (*SB. 1011, Sec. 11 (a)*). We are not opposed to having performance measures for public institutions of higher education; but experience shows that funding based on such measures simply does not work. In fact, eleven states, after having tried performance and outcome measure based funding have already abandoned it.
- 3) The proposal to remove position control for non-faculty positions from institutions of higher education (*S.B. 1000, Sec. 16*) will make it practically impossible for our institutions to respond to the changing needs of our students. Many of these positions are in academic support services. Necessary student services as well as instructional and research activities depend on them.

- 4) The present proposal (*S. B. 1000, Sec. 7 (b)*) further infringes on legislative authority by increasing the Governor's rescission power from 5% to 10%. The resulting uncertainty with regard to available resources will make institutional planning even more difficult.
- 5) For any institution of higher education to fulfill its mission and be competitive, it must have the autonomy to make educational decisions, which cannot be made except alongside of budgetary decisions. This is not to say that CSU should not be held accountable for how it spends the tax payers' money; this is only to say that the proposed degree of centralization and bureaucratic control are not needed to achieve that goal.

Thank you very much.